

Date: Tue, 15 Mar 94 04:30:08 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #132  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 15 Mar 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 132

Today's Topics:

      cmsg cancel <CMKzxr.Io7@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
          Morse Whiners

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Mon, 14 Mar 1994 20:55:24 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
Subject: cmsg cancel <CMKzxr.Io7@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <763546552snx@skyld.grendel.com> jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D.  
Angus) writes:

>  
>In article <CMLB8x.Knw@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@hawaii.edu writes:  
>  
> >  
> > <CMKzxr.Io7@news.Hawaii.Edu> was cancelled from within rn.  
> >  
>  
> This has to be a couple of your best postings Jeff. Bravo!  
>

Thank God for the (C)ancellation command. Let this be a lesson to  
prooof read prior to posting (or at least after a cup of coffee).

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: 15 Mar 94 04:30:33 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!  
dan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu  
Subject: Morse Whiners  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ez006683@chip.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

> Richard McAllister (rfm@urth.eng.sun.com) wrote:  
> : In article <1994Mar11.154358.9757@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu  
> : (Michael P. Deignan) writes:  
>  
> : [After deleting the post of his that I carefully included all of so  
> : everyone could see how Michael was way up on his libertarian high  
> : horse, self-righteously eschewing the use of government force in all  
> : ways, except in the area of protecting his tender ears from obscenities  
> : like "10-4" and "good buddy".]  
> Hey!! until I see MD's 10,000 word essay explaining why he wants to be  
> known as a libertarian I must ask you not to apply this name to him. :-)  
> Most libertarians I know would not want to be associated with MD.

That's Ok, neither do we Jeffersonians. :)

73,

Dan

--  
"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest  
reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is  
as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."  
-Thomas Jefferson

-----  
Date: 14 Mar 1994 19:44:05 GMT  
From: news.mentorg.com!hpbab33.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar10.232658.6028@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>,  
<1994Mar11.162937.12335@cs.brown.edu>, <1994Mar12.034902.15503@nosc.mil>  
Reply-To : Hank\_Oredson@mentorg.com  
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

In article <1994Mar12.034902.15503@nosc.mil>, keating@nosc.mil (Roger Keating)

writes:

```
|> In article <1994Mar11.162937.12335@cs.brown.edu>
|> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:
|>
|> > My repeater serves the entire amateur community. If you want to use it
|> > though, you'll have to assist in its upkeep. That involves a one-time
|> > usage fee, submission of an essay on "Why I want to use the repeater"
|> > (minimum 5,000 unique words, duplicates do not count), and passing (90%+)
|> > a comprehensive four-hour oral examination given by our Technical
|> > Advisory Committee. There's more to being a good user of a repeater than
|> > knowing how to wait for the courtesy tone to sound before keying up.
|>
|>
|> This is the most extensive pre-requisit I have ever heard of for use of
|> a repeater. What sort of problems did you have before you instituted
|> the examinations?
|> It begs so many questions: how many amateurs have applied and how many
|> have passed the first time. Are there classes offered to help
|> prospects pass the exams? What is the purpose of the essay? Must the
|> essay be in English? Is it judged on other qualities aside from unique
|> word use? What are the qualities? Are any of the essays worthy of
|> publishing or posting?
|> Is membership extended for life, or are there periodic re-qualification
|> exams?
|> Does the technical knowledge exceed that which the FCC requires for
|> repeater users?
|>
|> Roger Keating - KD6EFQ
|> keating@nosc.mil
```

Sounds to me like very simple and reasonable requirements on the potential user. If they are not interested enough to do some minimal qualification, they can just go use some other repeater.

There *are* requalification exams, right?  
Gotta somehow keep the riff-raff away, and make sure the users continue to meet those same minimal requirements.

Why isn't there an income test? You want low-life scum-sucking unemployed pencil-neck geeks to be able to use the machine?

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics  
Internet : hank\_oredson@mentorg.com  
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NOAM

-----

Date: 14 Mar 1994 19:48:30 GMT

From: news.mentorg.com!hpbab33.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar8.151030.7745@cs.brown.edu>,

<1994Mar10.171053.24169@cs.brown.edu>, <780@comix.UUCP>bab3

Reply-To : Hank\_Oredson@mentorg.com

Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

In article <780@comix.UUCP>, jeffl@comix.UUCP (Jeff Liebermann) writes:

|> In article <1994Mar10.171053.24169@cs.brown.edu> mpd@anomaly.sbs.com writes:

|> >

|> >He probably just ate a couple boxes of cereal and sent in those box tops

|> >to get the license. Competence? Kind of like "no purchase necessary

|> >to enter". But in amateur radio's case, "no competence necessary to

|> >enter".

|>

|> The typical automobile drivers licence exam tests "competence".

|> Yet, the idiots, drunks, and maniacs still pass the exam and kill.

"Kill others" is the keyword here, who cares if they kill themselves?

|> My illusion is that the licence exam is intended to test whether the

|> ham is competent enough to operate a radio without accidentally

|> trashing a frequency, destroying the radio, or electrocuting themselves.

As long as they don't electrocute others ... or destroy my radio ...

|> If the consensus deems it desirable to filter on the basis of

|> attitude, courtesy, tact, and entertainment value, then elementary

|> conversational English should be added to the exam. Most hams cannot

|> finish a complete sentence in less than 10 minutes. Some basic

|> forensics and oratory would also make listening to the conversations

|> more bearable. If the auto driver test model is accepted, then

|> testing for operation of their own (or similar) radio should be required.

|> I've seen too many hams that literally cannot program their own

|> handheld.

Good idea! We could test them on VCR programming also.

These are minimal skills any ham should prove before being allowed

to operate! A reasonable knowledge of classic literature should

also be required - don't you find those uneducated folks boring?

|> If the effort wasted in learning CW were re-directed to learning

|> theory, operation, or common courtesy, methinks we would have a

|> much better grade of ham.

We would?

What evidence do you have of this?

Perhaps the Morse-challenged denizens of the average 2M repeater?

"Hey, dit-dit good buddy!"

|> --

|> # Jeff Liebermann    Box 272        1540 Jackson Ave       Ben Lomond    CA    95005  
|> # 408.336.2558 voice   wb6ssy@ki6eh.#nocal.ca.usa   wb6ssy.ampr.org [44.4.18.10]  
|> # 408.699.0483 digital\_pager    73557,2074   cis [don't]  
|> # jeffl@comix.santa-cruz.ca.us   scruc.ucsc.edu!comix!jeffl

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics  
Internet        : hank\_oredson@mentorg.com  
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NOAM

-----

Date: Mon, 14 Mar 1994 08:55:11 -0600  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!ncar!asuvax!pitstop.mcd.mot.com!  
mcdphx!schbbs!mothost!lmpsbbs!NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar10.232658.6028@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>,  
<CSLE87-110394140340@145.39.1.10>, <2lsid5\$2e8@ccnet.ccnet.com>s  
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

In article <2lsid5\$2e8@ccnet.ccnet.com>, rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins  
n6fri) wrote:

> Karl Beckman (CSLE87) wrote:  
>KB In article <1994Mar10.232658.6028@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>,  
>KB glyle@marie.seas.ucla.edu (George Lyle (233789)) wrote:  
>  
>  
>KB There is no official mandate or authorization from the FCC for  
>KB "coordination" of stations in the Amateur Radio service. You do not need  
>KB approval to use a channel, provided that you are willing to share the  
>KB channel with other stations.  
>  
> Just a recommendation to seek coordination. The new station has primary  
> responsibility to mitigate interference with the existing coordinated  
> repeaters.  
>  
>KB Part 97.101b reads "Each station licensee and each control operator must  
>KB cooperate in selecting transmitting channels and in making the most

>KB effective use of the amateur service frequencies. No frequency will be  
>KB assigned for the exclusive use of any station."  
>KB  
>KB Some coordinating groups and many existing licensees ignore this  
>KB regulation, but by law the pool of repeater channels MUST be cooperatively  
>KB shared by ALL who desire to operate repeaters. The claim from the first  
>KB user that sharing will cause interference does not preclude the usage of  
>KB that frequency pair by multiple repeater stations within a given area. It's  
>KB the law, provided that no other channel would better serve both the new  
>KB station and all existing repeaters in the applicant's area.  
>  
> There will always be repeater frequencies available in the higher bands.  
> There are local amateurs waiting for their 2400 MHz mobile radios to  
> arrive from Japan so they can get ahead of the crowds. I understand there  
> are over a hundred 2400 MHz repeaters in Japan already. I know Motorola  
> wants this band for its own devices and would rather hams stack up 25  
> repeaters deep on 2 meters. All of the repeater growth in the Los Angeles  
> area is currently taking place in the 1280 MHz band. Check it out..the  
> band works better than 440.

Bob, when I post articles on the rec.radio.amateur section of the Net, I am doing so -strictly- as a 30-year amateur radio operator, though I do rely on my extensive experience in the telecommunications arena. That includes 39 years of my life enjoying radio, my college education and work as a Professional Engineer, 25 years serving on and chairing the Red Cross communications committee for Northeast Ohio, and 32 years with my amateur radio club. My present association with Motorola stops when my fingers hit these keys, and that separation is a condition of employment. The disclaimer in my sig pretty much covers things, though Motorola does provide a Net connection for all employees.

That having been said loudly, keep in mind that here in the USA the 2400 MHz band is NOT granted to amateurs on a primary or exclusive basis, nor is any other "amateur band" above 225 MHz that I have found. We hams operate in this band secondarily, sharing it with almost every microwave oven (most made by the Japanese, I might add!) as well as anything else that comes under the "ISM" allocations of Part 15. And worse yet, ALL of these users, including the hams, are secondary to whatever the federal government decides to put in that window, and it won't be MARS operations either! That has been the case for many years, it is nothing new, though some hams still seem to think that they own exclusively all frequencies in every band on which they are permitted to operate. I'm known here for saying RTFR, which stands for "Read The FCC Rules!"

>KB The ONLY place in Part 97 where coordination comes into play is in 97.205c,  
>KB where if harmful interference exists between two repeaters. When applied  
>KB along with 97.101d, which requires amateurs not to willfully or maliciously  
>KB interfere with any radio communication, only two problems could exist. The

>KB first would be one where both station operators picked the same CTCSS and  
>KB one had to change; the second where a previously coordinated station  
>KB insisted on operating without a coded squelch receiver and any others  
>KB co-channel stations used CTCSS but were not coordinated.

>

> Is this what they teach in Motorola Marketing school? Lets see..40 pl  
> tones and 70 dpl codes ... we could stack over 100 customers on a uhf  
> repeater channel in a given area. When they whimper about having to wait  
> 20 minutes to conduct their business amid all those howling heterodynes  
> we send out a new salesman who sells them on the advantages of going to  
> the next band. Now they are on an 800 MHz trunking system with all its  
> beeps and busy tones. New Technology comes along and those customers are  
> greeted by a new salesman who says that we are going digital...Motorola  
> bailed out of the trunking business. It is any wonder that small companies  
> went with Motorola Cellular?

No, Bob, commercial marketing has nothing to do with it. The amateur bands are shrinking, not growing, as you well know. Therefore the amateur community is being forced to adopt various forms of spectrum management and efficiency that in many cases have been the commercial norm for years. This is a far cry from the days not very long ago when amateur radio operators took a leadership position in technical development as well as operating skills.

Specifically, the amateur (and commercial) rules require a minimal amount of operator courtesy. Once a channel is in use, other persons may not interfere maliciously or willfully by transmitting at the same time. That should not have to be legally mandated, but in today's society there is little chance otherwise. We are not talking about 100 commercial customers, each with multiple units. We are talking about adding a second amateur repeater on some frequency pair that is already utilized by some other hams with a repeater. And we're talking about the single channel where the least impact would occur to the existing occupants.

> I can think of no amateurs that would consider the Motorola business model  
> coordination plan any benefit to the public service groups that use  
> amateur service repeaters. Most local coordinating bodies in the amateur  
> radio service recommend frequencies based on protecting the repeater  
> receiver from adjacent area users. Yes ctcss is used but never to cover  
> up a harmful interference as you might suggest. Ctcss covers the  
> occasional nuisance interference that is prevalent in all metropolitan  
> areas. One could consider the APCO public safety coordination model a  
> better plan for the amateur radio service.  
>

Your comments make my point better than I did. ALL FCC coordinating bodies are required by public law to represent NOT just the interests of existing vested users but those of ALL potential users of the spectrum. This

includes APCO, which does a good job in representing all eligibles, not all existing users to the detriment of any newcomers. Does your local or regional amateur repeater coordinating group measure up? Note that I did not say channel or frequency, but the total band in question. I do not consider sharing a repeater frequency pair to be harmful interference, so long as two operators don't both try to talk at the same time (This is the same standard hams use on other bands and with other modes, by the way). If they do, the laws of physics will determine who wins, not the coordinating committee or the output of a CTCSS decoder board. Luckily, neither the FCC nor UseNet posters have jurisdiction over the laws of physics yet, some local politicians' efforts notwithstanding.

>

> : > The practice of closing repeaters effectively denies use of the pair to  
> : > anyone who is not local to the area or who is not willing to pay the fees  
> : > required by the trustee of the closed repeater.

>

> : There is a recent (maybe still ongoing) California civil court case  
> : involving trustees of a repeater who specifically desired to exclude a few  
> : persons from operating through their repeater and jeopardizing the repeater  
> : license. The court filing included a letter from an FCC official. That  
> : letter, widely quoted here about two weeks ago, totally retracted the  
> : concept of "open" repeaters. The stated position of the FCC was that -any-  
> : repeater operator/trustee may deny use of their station to other amateurs  
> : at any time.

>

> The commission has never recognized the concept of open or closed  
> repeaters in its rules. Open or Closed is only a local tradition followed  
> by most amateurs.

Although they did not recognize it formally in print, the policy existed for many years. Had it not existed, there would have been no need for Ralph Haller to issue the lengthy letter filed with the court in that case. Again, your comment makes my point: there is no legal difference and all eligible users must be treated the same in the FCC rules and specifically in coordination policy.

>

> : > I feel that this practice is not in keeping with the spirit of Amateur Radio.

> : > In fact, requiring fees for the use of a frequency is no different than the  
> : > feared "auction of amateur spectrum" that is such a hot topic. Other radio  
> : > services exist to meet the needs of those who need private repeaters.

>

>KB From the above, the spirit of amateur radio is what the Commission says it  
>KB is, and it no longer (nor apparently did it ever) includes the unlimited  
>KB "right" to operate through someone else's station.

> :



> : > What I propose is that the coordination process for repeaters be changed to  
> : > provide priority to those trustees who are willing to make their systems  
> : > open to the general ham population without charge. Any pairs left over  
> : > will be distributed to those trustees who insist on closed systems.  
>  
>KB In view of the FCC position, your proposal would require either  
>KB discriminatory treatment of coordination applicants based on proposed  
>KB "open" system operation, or abandonment of legal license responsibility by  
>KB the station licensee. You can pick one or the other of the above  
>KB interpretations based on your position; both are illegal under Part 97.  
>  
> I agree. Most Open repeaters are really closed and most Closed repeaters  
> are always open to new membership.  
>  
> : > Trustees would still be free to charge fees for "bells and whistles"  
services  
> : > such as autopatch, linking, etc.  
> : >  
> : > As part of this coordination process, periodic checks should be made to  
> : > ensure that freq. pairs are being utilized as intended. If not, pairs would  
> : > be freed for other users.  
>  
>KB If your regional voluntary coordinating group is not reclaiming unused  
>KB channels, shame on them. Similarly, if they do not assign multiple stations  
>KB with CTCSS to the same frequency pair, shame on them. Join the group, make  
>KB your complaints known, encourage them to read the above quoted portions of  
>KB Part 97.  
>  
> This may all come to pass in the next five to ten years when all of the  
> analog radios are dumped into the amateur radio service. Re-farming the  
> commercial spectrum below 500 MHz into a digital radio service may prove  
> to be the undoing of the amateur repeater service we know today. I can  
> hear it now ... "Its not that he stole my frequency but he stole my PL"  
>

Bob, I doubt that digital will make any difference at all, and remember  
that amateurs are supposed to lead, not follow, in order to justify our  
frequency allocations. In fact I'm amazed that the hams at Dayton are often  
selling the newest (digital this year) equipment models before most  
customers have had a chance to buy it for commercial use. But I guess  
Motorola will have to get some better adhesives, because most of the type  
acceptance / serial number plates seem to fall off on those early  
production units :-)

>  
> : > This coordination scheme would ensure that all available spectrum would be  
> : > provided to those trustees who wish to serve the entire amateur community.  
> : >

> : > Comments?  
> : >  
> : >  
> : > George Lyle, N7TNJ/6, ex KA7HXF  
>  
> Standard disclaimer: I own a Motorola repeater, mobiles and portables all  
> operating in the amateur radio service. I just don't know any better ...  
> products.

There's just no arguing about the need for quality, regardless of the  
source. We all need more of it in everything we do, everything we touch.  
None of us is perfect, but we sure can try to make today better than  
yesterday.

>  
>KB --  
>KB Karl Beckman, P.E. < STUPIDITY is an elemental force for which >  
>KB Motorola Comm - Fixed Data < no earthquake is a match. -- Karl Kraus >  
>KB  
>KB The statements and opinions expressed here are not those of Motorola Inc.  
>KB Motorola paid a marketing firm a huge sum of money to get their opinions;  
>KB they have made it clear that they do not wish to share those of employees.  
>KB  
>KB Amateur radio WA8NVW @ K8MR.NEOH.USA.NA NavyMARS VBH @ NOGBN.NOASI

> Bob n6fri  
>  
> --  
> Bob Wilkins work bwilkins@cave.org  
> Berkeley, California home rwilkins@ccnet.com  
> 94701-0710 play n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.usa.noam

--  
Karl Beckman, P.E. < STUPIDITY is an elemental force for which >  
Motorola Comm - Fixed Data < no earthquake is a match. -- Karl Kraus >

The statements and opinions expressed here are not those of Motorola Inc.  
Motorola paid a marketing firm a huge sum of money to get their opinions;  
they have made it clear that they do not wish to share those of employees.

Amateur radio WA8NVW @ K8MR.NEOH.USA.NA NavyMARS VBH @ NOGBN.NOASI

-----  
Date: Mon, 14 Mar 1994 21:18:25 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!  
chip.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Mar10094545@urth.eng.sun.com>,  
<1994Mar11.154358.9757@cs.brown.edu>, <RFM.94Mar14112752@urth.eng.sun.com>  
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

Richard McAllister (rfm@urth.eng.sun.com) wrote:  
: In article <1994Mar11.154358.9757@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu  
: (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

: [After deleting the post of his that I carefully included all of so  
: everyone could see how Michael was way up on his libertarian high  
: horse, self-righteously eschewing the use of government force in all  
: ways, except in the area of protecting his tender ears from obscenities  
: like "10-4" and "good buddy".]

Hey!! until I see MD's 10,000 word essay explaining why he wants to be  
known as a libertarian I must ask you not to apply this name to him. :-)  
Most libertarians I know would not want to be associated with MD.

cheers,

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu             *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                    Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
* All opinions expressed herein are completely fictitious any *
* resemblance to actual opinions of persons living or dead is  *
* completely coincidental.                                     *
*-----*
```

-----  
Date: 14 Mar 1994 19:51:49 GMT  
From: news.mentorg.com!hpbab33.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar10.232658.6028@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>,  
<1994Mar11.162937.12335@cs.brown.edu>, <CMKz3H.Jxr@news.direct.net>hpb  
Reply-To : Hank\_Oredson@mentorg.com  
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

In article <CMKz3H.Jxr@news.direct.net>, nu7i@indirect.com (Darrell Shandrow)  
writes:

|> Nobody's telling you that you must have your closed repeater on the ham  
|> bands. If you must charge for use of your repeater then you ought to

|> shut down and move to the land mobile or similar services.  
|> Yes, I do agree that those who use a repeater often ought to support the  
|> club. However, I'd hate to see the day when somebody who has a low  
|> income and a simple radio gets a license and then can't use any repeaters  
|> because they are all closed. Anyone who wants a closed repeater is an  
|> elitist! 73

And pray tell what is wrong with being an "elitist"?

Isn't that what ham radio is all about? "We" got the license, and so "we"  
can do things that "they" who did not get the license cannot do.

Or do you advocate issuing licenses to \*everyone\* no matter what  
their qualifications might be? Doing so would avoid being "elitist".

This "elitist" thing not so simple ...

|> --  
|> Darrell Shandrow at Arizona State University  
|> Member: National Federation of the Blind  
|> "Proud, Angry, and Strong" -- quoted from Jennifer Restle  
|> (The complete information access agenda - You print it you braille it too!)

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics  
Internet : hank\_oredson@mentorg.com  
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NOAM

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #132

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*